

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 14, 15, and 17-21 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, 15, 17, and 18, and have canceled claims 13, 16, 22, and 23. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 4-8, 10, 11, 18-20, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Suzuki et al.* (“*Suzuki*”) (US 2004/0008363 A1) in combination with *Mizuki* (US 5,623,675) (as noted above, Applicants have herein canceled claims 22 and 23). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Suzuki* and *Mizuki* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in independent claims 1 and 18, as amended herein, obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1 and 18 to include the features specified in original claim 16. As defined in amended claims 1 and 18, the claimed subject includes a duplication process module. In response to a duplication instruction with specification of a print job under creation, the duplication process module duplicates a registered image corresponding to the specified print job under creation, creates a new print job under creation at a stage of registering the duplicated image, and stores the new print job under creation into the information storage module.

As recognized by the Examiner, neither the *Suzuki* reference nor the *Mizuki* reference discloses or suggests a duplication process module as specified in amended claims 1 and 18. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mizuki* and *Suzuki* as applied against claim 1, and further in view of *Terada et al.* (“*Terada*”) (US 7,055,150 B2). To the extent that the obviousness rejection of claim 16 might be considered applicable to amended claims 1 and 18, Applicants respond as follows.

The *Terada* reference discloses a printer system for installing printer firmware to a printer through a network. As stated in the *Terada* reference, “[t]he printer according to the present invention functions printing data onto a print medium, the media can be one of separate form, continuous form or duplication form.” Column 15, lines 11-13. Relative to the claimed subject matter, however, the *Terada* reference does not disclose or suggest the feature of duplicating a registered image corresponding to a print job. As such, even if the *Mizuki*, *Suzuki*, and *Terada* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the subject matter defined in present claims 1 and 18 would not have resulted. Thus, the combination of the *Mizuki*, *Suzuki*, and *Terada* references would not have rendered the subject matter defined in present claims 1 and 18 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1 and 18, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of the *Mizuki*, *Suzuki*, and *Terada* references. Claims 4-8, 10, and 11, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, and claims 19 and 20, each of which depends from claim 18, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of the *Mizuki*, *Suzuki*, and *Terada* references for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

Dependent Claims

Each of dependent claims 2, 3, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 21 ultimately depends from either claim 1 or claim 18. In the Office Action, each of the above-listed dependent claims was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Mizuki* and *Suzuki*, and further in view of various secondary references including *Yokoyama* (US 7,126,719 B2), *Shiota et al.* (US 6,324,521 B1), and *Terada*. Neither the *Yokoyama* reference nor the *Shiota et al.* reference cures the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of

the *Mizuki*, *Suzuki*, and *Terada* references relative to the subject matter defined in present claims 1 and 18. Accordingly, claims 2, 3, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Mizuki* and *Suzuki*, and further in view of one or more of *Yokoyama*, *Shiota et al.*, and *Terada* for at least the reason that each of these claims depends from either claim 1 or claim 18.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-12, 14, 15, and 17-21, as presented herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ITECP008).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920